<u>REMARKS</u>

Claims 1-4, 6-24 and 26-30 and 32-34 are currently pending in the subject application and are presently under consideration. Claims 1, 7, 16, 23, 24, 32 and 33 have been amended as shown on pp. 2-7 of the Reply. Applicant's representative thanks the Examiner for the courtesies extended during the telephonic interview on May 8, 2007. No agreement was reached. Favorable reconsideration of the subject patent application is respectfully requested in view of the comments and amendments herein.

I.   **Objection of Claims 7 and 16**

Claims 7 and 16 are objected to for various informalities. Claims 7 and 16 have been amended herein to cure such informalities. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that this objection should be withdrawn.

II.   **Rejection of Claims 1-4, 6, 7, 9-12, 20, 22-24, 26, 28, 29, 32 and 33 Under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)**

Claims 1-4, 6, 7, 9-12, 20, 22-24, 26, 28, 29, 32 and 33 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Sadahiro (U.S. 6,237,136). It is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn for at least the following reasons. Sadahiro does not disclose, teach or suggest each and every limitation recited by the subject claims.

> A single prior art reference anticipates a patent claim only if it *expressly or inherently describes each and every limitation set forth in the patent claim*. *Trintec Industries, Inc. v. Top-U.S.A. Corp.*, 295 F.3d 1292, 63 USPQ2d 1597 (Fed. Cir. 2002); *See Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). The *identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim*. *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989) (emphasis added).

The claimed subject matter relates to automated discovery of information. A software developer, for example, can discover and interpret technology-specific and programming-language-specific functionality utilizing natural and professional languages that may be independent of that employed by the author of the associated technical documentation describing

such functionality. In particular, independent claim 1 recites *a system that facilitates finding documentation comprising* **a query component that receives a request for technical documentation, the request comprising terminology of a first vocabulary corresponding to a first programming language**, *a mapping component that correlates terminology of the first vocabulary to semantically equivalent terminology of a second vocabulary related to a second programming language and* **a discovery component that retrieves technical articles based upon the terminology of the second vocabulary that is semantically equivalent to the terminology of the first vocabulary employed in the request**. Independent claims 23, 24, 32 and 33 recite similar limitations. Sadahiro does not disclose, teach or suggest such aspects.

Sadahiro relates to generating source code files for an application program in a computer system. A user first produces a code flow description file. A source code file written in a programming language is generated based upon the code flow description file. (*See* Abstract). The code flow description file specifies a process or procedure to be performed employing a data acquisition device. For example, the code flow description files describes which inputs to poll and the processing that is performed with input data. A code generator creates a source code file in a target programming language (*e.g.*, C++, Basic, Java, etc.) that can be compiled and/or executed to carry out the tasks expressed in the code flow description file. (*See* Summary). Thus, Sadahiro discloses mechanisms to convert a program written in pseudo-code format to a program described in a programming language operable on a computer system and does not disclose retrieval of technical information.

In particular, Sadahiro is silent regarding a query component a query component that receives a request for technical articles as recited by the subject claims. Rather, Sadahiro discloses a user specifying a target programming language(s) to which the computational procedure expressed in a code flow description file is converted. A user employs a simplified language including elements common to the target programming languages to code an application procedure for a data acquisition device. Sadahiro nowhere discloses a user employing terminology from a first vocabulary corresponding to a first programming language to request technical articles.

Furthermore, Sadahiro does not disclose, teach or suggest retrieving technical articles based upon terminology of a second vocabulary corresponding to a second programming language that is functionally and/or semantically equivalent to the terminology of the first

vocabulary employed in making the request. Sadahiro *generates or creates* a source code file by translating or converting the procedure described in the code flow description file. Sadahiro relates to generating new source code file and does not disclose retrieving technical articles.

In view of at least the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that Sadahiro does not disclose, teach or suggest each and every limitation recited by independent claims 1, 23, 24, 32 and 33 (and the subsequent dependent claims which depend there from). Accordingly, this rejection should be withdrawn and the claims allowed.

III.   Rejection of Claims 8, 13-19, 27, 30 and 34 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 8, 13-19, 27, 30 and 34 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over by Sadahiro in view of Hofmann (U.S. 6,687,696). It is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn for at least the following reason. Claims 8, 13-19, 27, 30 and 34 respectively depend from independent claims 1, 24 and 33, and Hofmann does not rectify the deficiencies presented by Sadahiro with respect to the independent claims as discussed above. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

IV.   Rejection of Claim 21 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claim 21 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Sadahiro (U.S. Patent 6,237,136) in view of Jennings ("Special Edition Using Access 97, Second Edition", published 9 October 1997, section "Working with Relations, Key Fields, and Indexes"). Withdrawal of this rejection is requested for at least the following reasons. The cited references do not teach or suggest each and every limitation of the subject claims. Claim 21 depends from independent claims 1 and Jennings fails to cure the aforementioned deficiencies of Sadahiro. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

The present application is believed to be in condition for allowance in view of the above comments and amendments. A prompt action to such end is earnestly solicited.

In the event any fees are due in connection with this document, the Commissioner is authorized to charge those fees to Deposit Account No. 50-1063 [MSFTP491US].

Should the Examiner believe a telephone interview would be helpful to expedite favorable prosecution, the Examiner is invited to contact applicant's undersigned representative at the telephone number below.

Respectfully submitted,

AMIN, TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP

/Himanshu S. Amin/
Himanshu S. Amin
Reg. No. 40,894

AMIN, TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP
24TH Floor, National City Center
1900 E. 9TH Street
Cleveland, Ohio 44114
Telephone (216) 696-8730
Facsimile (216) 696-8731